UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,816	09/18/2003	Susann Marie Keohane	AUS920030442US1	8940
77351 IBM CORP. (A	7590 11/10/200 .US)	EXAMINER		
C/O MUNSCH HARDT KOPF & HARR, P.C.			DAILEY, THOMAS J	
3800 LINCOLN PLAZA 500 N. AKARD STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75201-6659			2452	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/666,816	KEOHANE ET AL.			
Examiner initiation interview Gainmary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Thomas J. Dailey	2452			
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>App</u>	Status of Application: <u>Appeal Brief Filed</u>			
(1) <u>Thomas J. Dailey</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>James Baudino</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 28 October 2009	Time: <u>3:45 PM EST</u>				
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: See Continuation Sheet					
Claims discussed: 1 and 3-10					
Prior art documents discussed: N/A					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview			
/Kenny S Lin/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of rejections discussed: Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Brogne et al (EP Pub. No. 1,087,321), hereafter "Brogne," in view of Milewski et al (US Pat. 5,930,471), hereafter "Milewski."

Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Brogne et al (EP Pub. No. 1,087,321), hereafter "Brogne," in view of Nielsen (US Pat. 5,870,548) and in further view Milewski et al (US Pat. 5,930,471), hereafter "Milewski,".

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner telephoned appellant in regards to the conclusion reached during the appeal conference with Kenny Lin and Bunjob Jareonchonwanit. Specifically, it was concluded that the rejections of claims 1 and 3-6 were valid and may proceed to the board of appeals and the rejections of claims 7-10 should be withdrawn.

The appellant indicated their desire to proceed to the board with regards to claims 1 and 3-6 and therefore an Examiner's answer to the Appeal Brief will be forthcoming.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is 571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday; 9:00am - 5:00pm.

/T. J. D./ Examiner, Art Unit 2452.